## For the Northern District of California

28

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7	TOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	
9	WAYMO LLC, No. C 17-00939 WHA
10	Plaintiff,
11	v.
12	UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; ORDER REQUIRING FURTHER RESPONSE RE
13	UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; OTTOMOTTO LLC; and OTTO TRUCKING LLC,  FURTHER RESPONSE RE UNJUST ENRICHMENT
14	Defendants.
15	/
16	Do both sides agree that acquisition alone can be enough to support an unjust
17	enrichment award under both CUTSA and DTSA? The Court had understood that Waymo's
18	unjust enrichment theory in our case depended on use or disclosure. Has Waymo preserved an
19	unjust enrichment theory based on acquisition alone? Please answer these follow-up questions
20	by December 18 at noon.
21	
22	IT IS SO ORDERED.
23	
24	Dated: December 15, 2017.
25	WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26	
27	